



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

7
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/560,329

12/10/2005

Jung Moon Kim

4240-138

9719

23448

7590

06/26/2007

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY / TECHNOLOGY LAW

PO BOX 14329

RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

MACFARLANE, STACEY NEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1609

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/26/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/560,329

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Stacey MacFarlane

Art Unit

1609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claim(s) 1-9 and 18-22, drawn to vectors and compositions comprising a non-activated tissue-regeneration polypeptide (TRP) containing (a) a protein transduction domain (PTD) allowing the polypeptide to permeate the cell without membrane receptors, (b) a furin activation domain (FAD) which has at least one proprotein convertase cleavage site and is cleaved to form an active tissue regeneration domain, and (c) a non-activated protein transduction domain which is activated by convertase cleavage.

Group 2, claim(s) 10 and 11, drawn to a recombinant vector with an FAD-encoding base sequence, a 5' TRD-encoding DNA, a PTD base sequence, a base sequence for tagging and at least four histidine-encoding base sequences for separation and purification.

Group 3, claim(s) 12-17, drawn to a method for preparing non-activated TRP comprising (a) culturing transformed bacteria and (b) centrifuging, removing the polypeptide and purifying the polypeptide.

2. The inventions listed as Groups 1-3 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Claims are drawn to a fusion protein comprising a protein transduction domain (PTD) and a non-activated

Art Unit: 1609

tissue regeneration domain that is activated upon convertase cleavage. Dependent claims recite the fusion protein can consist of any one of many different proteins that are loosely classified as "tissue-regeneration polypeptides", for example β -amyloid or the matrix metalloproteinases. The expression "special technical feature" is defined in Rule 13.2 as meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the inventions makes over the prior art. Whether a particular feature makes a contribution over the prior art, is considered with respect to novelty and inventive step. In the instant application, the fusion protein comprising a protein transduction domain (PTD) and a non-activated tissue regeneration domain that is activated upon convertase cleavage does not make a contribution over the prior art. The following reference teaches a fusion protein comprising the PTD of HIV TAT (paragraph 73) and proprotein convertase-1 cleavage sequence (Table 2) that triggers the release and absorption ("activation") of salmon calcitonin (Stern et al. US Patent 6673574, published June 26, 2003). The '574 Patent further recites that calcitonin is a treatment of osteoporosis, a bone deteriorating disease (Paragraph 6), thus teaching a tissue-regeneration polypeptide. The prior art recites the common technical feature of Groups 1-3, thus, there is no special technical feature over the prior art and the application lacks Unity of Invention under PCT Rule 13.1.

Furthermore, there is no single inventive concept unifying these structurally distinct proteins with very different functions, rather they correspond to distinct technical features. For example, a composition for stimulating the formation or regeneration of tissue (Claim 18) would be structurally and functionally distinct depending upon the

Art Unit: 1609

peptides from which it was constructed, and would exhibit different effects, functions and outcomes depending upon the tissue on which it was used. Accordingly, because of the distinct species claimed, Groups 1-3 are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

Species Election

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Elect one of the following TRD polypeptides from Claim 5 or 13: BMPs, TGF- β , β -NGF (β -nerve growth factor), β -amyloid, ADAMs (a disintegrin and metalloproteinase-like), TNF- α , MMPs (matrix metalloproteinases), and insulin-like growth factor (IGF-1). Further electing a single corresponding sequence from SEQ ID NOs: 1-13 (Claims 6 or 14).

Elect one FAD sequence from the following (Claim 7 or 15): SEQ ID NOs: 14 to 26.

Elect one of the following PTD sequences (Claim 8 or 16): TAT, drosophila melanogaster-derived Antp peptide, VP22 peptide and mph-1 -btm.

Elect one of the following growth factors (Claims 20 and 22): TGF- β , IGF, PDGF, or FGF.

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is

Art Unit: 1609

finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claim 1 is generic for Group 1, Claim 10 is generic to Group 2, and Claim 12 is generic to Group 3.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Art Unit: 1609

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

Art Unit: 1609

commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stacey MacFarlane whose telephone number is (571) 270-3057. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30AM-4:00 PM & ALT. Fridays, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mary Mosher can be reached on (571) 272-0906. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1609

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



MARY MOSHER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

6-20-07